

Serial No.: 09/943,535

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are presently under consideration in the application. The specification and claim 1 have been amended herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification is objected to as referring to claim numbers which may be changed or canceled by applicants. In response, applicants have amended the specification to remove such claim numbers and replace them with paraphrases of the respective independent claims. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3, 6, 9 AND 12-16 UNDER 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1-3, 6, 9 and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) based on *Okumura et al.* Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

A feature of the present invention relates to a trade-off between image quality and power consumption as illustrated, for example, in Fig. 5 of the present application. By way of the invention, it becomes possible to use less power when displaying a smaller number of colors. According to a particular aspect, the present invention detects the color format of an input signal and directs a data driver to operate in a corresponding display mode.

In order to emphasize further such feature of the invention, claim 1 has been amended as noted above to refer to such different *color* formats. More particularly, claim 1 recites how the multi-format digital data driver is arranged to receive digital input data in a plurality of different *color* formats. In addition, claim 1 recites how the data analysis means determines the color format of the input data, and controls the data driver to operate in the display mode corresponding to the *color* format. Support for such amendment may be found, for example, in Fig. 5 and the accompanying description.

Serial No.: 09/943,535

Regarding *Okumura et al.*, the Examiner contends that the moving/standstill picture detection circuit 52 or displacement pixel detection circuit 64 could constitute the "data analysis means" recited in claim 1. Applicants acknowledge that *Okumura et al.* does describe a standstill/moving picture detection circuit (e.g., a control amount detection circuit 85 in Fig. 10) used to detect whether signals for one scanning line of an image or signal or one pixel thereof are changing. (See, e.g., Col. 19, Ins. 7-14). Based on whether the data represents a moving or standstill picture, the particular scanning method may be controlled. (See, e.g., Col. 19, In. 65 to Col. 20, In. 12).

However, *Okumura et al.* does not teach or suggest any type of detection circuit for determining among different color formats of the input data as recited in amended claim 1. Nor does *Okumura et al.* teach or suggest controlling the data driver to operation in a display mode (e.g., interlacing) corresponding to the determined color format as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom is respectfully requested.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-4, 9-10, 12 AND 14 UNDER 35 USC §102(e)

Claims 1-4, 9-10, 12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) based on *Miyamoto*. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Miyamoto describes a display system for displaying a plurality of different types of display modes. Moreover, *Miyamoto* describes changing the number of scanning lines of the display when increasing the resolution (Col. 6, Ins. 16-22), and also changing the data input to the display when reducing the resolution (Col. 5, Ins. 33-40).

However, *Miyamoto* does not teach or suggest determining the color format of the input signal as recited in amended claim 1. Furthermore, *Miyamoto* does not teach or suggest changing the display mode of the data driver to correspond to the determined color format as recited in amended claim 1.

As a result, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom is respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 09/943,535

IV. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 5-8, 11, 13 AND 15-16 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 5 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Miyamoto*. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Okumura et al.* in view of *Koyama et al.* Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Okumura et al.* or *Miyamoto* in view of *Cairns et al.* Claims 15-16 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Okumura et al.* in view of *Misawa et al.*

Each of claims 5-8, 11, 13 and 15-16 depend from claim 1 either directly or indirectly. Therefore, these claims may be distinguished over the teachings of *Okumura et al.* and *Miyamoto* for at least the same reasons recited above. Moreover, the secondary references of *Koyama et al.*, *Cairns et al.* and *Misawa et al.* do not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in *Okumura et al.* and *Miyamoto*.

Thus, withdrawal of each of the rejections is respectfully requested.

V. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1-16 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Serial No.: 09/943,535

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP



Mark D. Saralino
Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: March 16, 2004

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113
C:\GENYAMA\yamap777.0md.wpd